

|                          |                        |  |                     |  |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> |  | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                          | 10/584,303             |  | BRINK ET AL.        |  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b>        |  | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                          | JULIE HA               |  | 1654                |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JULIE HA.

(3) JUDITH EVANS.

(2) CECILIA TSANG.

(4) MICHAEL ROSEN; (5) JERRY KOKOSHKA.

Date of Interview: January 04, 2011.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: Taheri et al (US Patent No. 6,690,970).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☒ was not reached.    h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms. Evans discussed the differences between the instant claims and the cited prior art, Taheri et al. Taheri et al teach growin mesenchymal stem cells in vitro, but the cells are not in strips, and they are injected into the valve using a syringe, which would disrupt the cells. The instant claims are drawn to a method of creating an atrioventricular bypass tract for a heart, comprising growing mesenchymal stem cells in vitro into a strip with two ends. The instant claims clearly recites that the strip is made in vitro prior to attching the ends to the heart. The Examiner will consider the response to the outstanding office action. Applicant is not required to respond to this interview summary.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Julie Ha/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654